



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CORRESPONDENCE.

EINSTEIN'S *Italian Renaissance in England*.

Dear Mr. Woodberry :

I have read Miss Mary Augusta Scott's review of my *Italian Renaissance in England*, in the current (September) number of the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, and while desiring to avoid all controversy on this subject, I can hardly allow so serious a charge on my literary honesty to remain unanswered.

Miss Scott states that more than one-half of the printed sources contained in my bibliography are to be found in her *Elizabethan Translations from the Italian*. I should be the last to deny it. Indeed, if I remember rightly, most of the titles will be found in Lowndes' and Hazlitt's bibliographies, as well as in Miss Scott's. She further declares that 'sixty-four of these works, titles from the *Elizabethan Translations from the Italian*,' are cited in my foot-notes, and 'seventy-two of these titles' are mentioned in my text, 'some of them repeatedly.' To all this I assent, failing to see how two writers can treat a similar and limited subject without going to many of the same sources for their information. But, I further say, what you already know, that, with one exception, not a book do I mention in my bibliography or elsewhere, which I did not *consult directly for myself*. *The Italian Ape, the English Imitation*, a title not contained in Miss Scott's bibliography, is the only book I refer to (and I do so in a foot-note), which I did not see for myself, for I could find it in none of the great English libraries.

Miss Scott's most serious charge against me is this : 'nor do considerably more than one hundred direct allusions exhaust the indebtedness of the *Italian Renaissance in England* to the *Elizabethan Translations from the Italian* for matter and ideas.' It would be unfair to Miss Scott to assume that she had not chosen her strongest examples to prove and fortify so direct a statement. She selects, in fact, only two. The first, which she dwells on at length,

is as follows: in my *Italian Renaissance* a brief allusion to Cataneo's *Military Tactics* (p. 96) is succeeded by a mention of Tartaglia's work on gunnery, following the same order as in her article. There were only three or four books on military science translated by the Elizabethans from the Italian, and if, in mentioning them all in a single paragraph, as I did, I took them in their chronological order, thus following Miss Scott's example, the coincidence appears stranger to her mind than to mine. Moreover, it would scarcely have been necessary to have gone to her for the information, even if I had not possessed it at first hand. Mr. Cockle's admirable *Bibliography of English Military Books up to 1642*, which I refer to in the foot-note, enters *far more fully* into this subject. I alluded to Cataneo's book as *Military Tactics* in order to describe the nature of the work as briefly as possible, for the Elizabethan title of *Most briefe Tables* is here meaningless to the modern reader. At no time did I pretend to give a critical bibliography of the subject. A beginning has here been made by Miss Scott; I neither attempted to rival nor to emulate her work. The second and last example Miss Scott selects is in her statement that I have cited *The History of Travayle* and *The Decades of the Newe Worlde* in my foot-note (p. 279), '(but without reference to the source of authority) from the *Elizabethan Translations from the Italian*.' Surely, if I was able to refer to over forty manuscripts relating to Italian and English without going to her work, why should I have to turn to it for the titles of the two best known Elizabethan books of travel, which are even described in the *Dictionary of National Biography* !

These are the *only examples* she selects and mentions to prove the extent of my indebtedness to her articles. The rest of her review is devoted to pointing out the inaccuracies in my book. She accuses me of inconsistency in spelling Elizabethan names. To this I can only plead guilty, holding up a protecting mantle in Shakespeare, who found several ways in which to spell his own name. I fear it is we of to-day who are burdened with the fetish of consistency, which is the bane of little minds. But I sympathize with Miss Scott in this, even though I have rarely opened a book of that period where the writer did not succeed in spelling his name in more than one way; the case of *Whitehorne* becoming *Withorne* (p. 400) is but one in point. A similar state of affairs existed in France, and even in Italy, where Latinization so frequently caused

the evil. Thus *Aconzio* became *Acontio*. Usage varied there, even locally. It was a Tuscan custom, for instance, for *Giovanni Boccacci* to be spoken of as *Il Boccaccio*.

I am rightly charged with error in bringing under one title two different books by Robert Greene, *Perimides* and *Philomela*. This, I regret to say, was due to careless proof-reading in allowing the *and* to pass italicized, a fault which the third edition of my book has remedied. The only remaining serious charge is when Miss Scott deplores my ignorance of literary history in saying (p. 317), that 'the Scotch Chaucerians, although familiar with a few of the Italian writers, failed to appreciate their true spirit.' She wittily remarks that they failed to do so 'for the same reason that they failed to appreciate the Pyramids of Egypt, because they were out of their ken.' I should here like to refer her to Gawin Douglas' *Palice of Honour* (edit. Small, 1. 35), where Petrarch is mentioned specifically. Elsewhere, too, in Douglas she will find frequent references to Boccaccio, Valla, and Poggio, while Sir David Lyndsay's works also contain allusions to the same writers.

Very sincerely yours,

LEWIS EINSTEIN.

AMERICAN EMBASSY, PARIS,
11 November, 1903.
